

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-23, 26, and 27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the disclosure and claims 1, 2, 9-12, 20, and 21 have been amended, claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 24, and 25 have been cancelled, and new claims 26 and 27 have been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **II. Objection to the Specification**

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action object to the specification. Paragraph 1 objects to the inclusion of an embedded hyperlink or other browser executable code. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as submitted does not include any “browser executable code” that is intended to incorporate information by reference. Section 608.01 of the MPEP and in particular, §608.01(p) states that the Examiner should object to browser executable code when this code contains an active link and forms an improper incorporation by reference. However, Section 608.01 also states that “When the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes are part of applicant’s invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks.” Should the Examiner find any active links in the patent specification, the Examiner is invited to disable these links when preparing the text for loading on the USPTO web database.

Applicants respectfully submit that any code included in the specification is for the purpose of meeting the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 2 objects to a typographical error in the specification. By this Amendment, the applicants have corrected the error. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 24, and 25 for being of improper dependent form. The Amendment cancels the above-mentioned claims, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### **IV. Rejection of claim 11-17 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C §102(b)**

Claims 11-17 and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over “HTM in Style: Using Cascading Style Sheets” in the Spring 1999 Digital Systems Report authored by Anthony N. Mione (hereinafter “Mione”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that portions of the method of claim 11 are disclosed in Mione and that other portions are inherent in the disclosure of Mione. Mione discloses the use of cascading style sheets (also discussed in the background section of the present specification). In Mione, on page 2, column 1, second through fourth paragraphs, a “style tag” can be placed in the header of an HTML document to designate style information that will be used only for the current document. As is apparent from the subsequent text of Mione, in order for the style tag of Mione to be useful, a body specifying particular style characteristics must follow the style tag.

Mione fails to show every feature of claims 11 and 20. In the methods of claim 11 and claim 20, a defined theme is defined within the appearance manager that renders the graphical component. Specifically, claim 11 as amended defines “determining whether a defined theming flag is set by the application, the defined theming flag providing an indicator related to a defined theme, the defined theme contained within the appearance manager and comprising a set of appearance characteristics including at least graphical component parts information and graphical component location information”. Claim 11 additionally includes “routing the rendering request for the graphical component to the appearance manager if the theming flag is present, wherein the appearance manager assigns themed appearance characteristics to the graphical component based on the defined theme”.

Mione fails to disclose a defined theming flag and the use of a theme defined within an appearance manager to render a graphical component. Mione further fails to disclose a theme defined by graphical component parts information and graphical component location information.

With regard to claim 20, Mione fails to teach or disclose “determining whether a theme style is specified in routing the rendering request for the graphical component to the appearance manager” if cascading style sheet properties are not specified. Mione further fails to disclose “determining whether a theme style is specified in the web page”, wherein the theme style provides “an indicator related to a defined theme, the defined theme being defined within the appearance manager and comprising a set of appearance characteristics including at least parts information and location information for the graphical component”. Mione further fails to disclose the appearance manager assigning “themed appearance characteristics, in accordance with the defined theme, to the graphical component and renders the graphical component on the display”.

Mione does not disclose an appearance manager having a defined theme therein. All style and rendering information in Mione must be specified within an HTML document, resulting in stylistic renderings specific to each document, rather than a global theme, defined within an appearance manager that can be utilized by any HTML or non-HTML requestor. Mione requires that the “style tag” be followed by additional style information in the “body” of the HTML document in order for rendering to occur. One innovation of the presently claimed invention is that the defined theme information is contained within the appearance manager that renders the graphical component and need not be re-iterated by each HTML document.

With regard to dependent claims 12 and 21, Mione fails to disclose that the graphical component being requested and rendered is a control and the set of appearance characteristics additionally comprises state information indicating a state of the control.

With regard to claims 13, 16, and 17, Applicants note that although the rejection is grouped as a §102(b) rejection along with the aforementioned claims, the

rejection is actually based on 35 U.S.C. §103 as the teachings from “10 Questions About Meta Data” by Amy Cowen (hereinafter “Cowen”) are used to modify Mione.

The Office Action alleges that Mione fails to disclose the use of META tags, but that it would have been obvious to use META tags as taught by Cowen. However, applicants respectfully submit that Cowen fails to obviate the deficiencies of Mione as set forth above.

The references fail to render obvious the claimed invention. Even if combined, Mione and Cowen fail to disclose the features of the aforementioned claims. These claims are also allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 11 and 20.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 11 and claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 20. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 11 and 20.

Accordingly, claims 11-17 and 20-23 are allowable over the art of record and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 25**

Claims 1-10 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mione in view of Cowen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that Mione discloses the features of claim 1, but fails to disclose that the tags are META tags. The Office Action further states that Cowen discloses META tags and that it would have been obvious to modify Mione by implementing META tags as taught by Cowen.

Even if combined, Mione and Cowen fail to disclose all of the features of independent claims 1 and 9.

With regard to claim 1, Mione and Cowen fail to disclose “determining whether a defined theme META tag is present in the web page” and “the defined theme META tag providing an indicator related to a defined theme, the defined theme being defined within the appearance manager and comprising a set of appearance characteristics including at least parts information and location information for the graphical component”. Mione and Cowen further fail to disclose “routing the rendering

request for the graphical component to the appearance manager if the defined theme META tag is present, wherein the appearance manager assigns themed appearance characteristics in accordance with the defined theme to the graphical component and renders the graphical component on the display".

With regard to claim 9, even if combined, Mione and Cowen fail to disclose utilizing, by the web page, a defined theme META tag, the defined theme META tag providing an indicator related to a defined theme, the defined theme being defined within the appearance manager and comprising a set of appearance characteristics including at least parts information and location information for the graphical component.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and claim 10 depends from claim 9. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in relation to claims 1 and 9.

Accordingly claims 1-6, 9, and 10 are allowable over the art of record and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **VI. Rejection of Claims 18, 19, and 24**

Claims 18, 19, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mione. Claims 18, 19, and 24 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

#### **VII. New Claims 26 and 27**

New claim 26 is a system claim that emphasizes the components of the invention that enable graphical component rendering in accordance with a theme defined within the theme manager. Claim 27 is an apparatus claim that substantially corresponds to the method of claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the references of record fail to teach or disclose the features of these newly added claims.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-23, 26, and 27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending

rejections and allowance of claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-23, 26, and 27. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kerry H. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,412

Date: October 7, 2003

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
One Kansas City Place  
1200 Main Street  
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-2118  
(816) 474-6550